

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boiocchi (USPN 5,695,578) in view of Kojima (JP 58167203). Applicant traverses this rejection because Boiocchi and Kojima, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that the coating rubber of at least the extension portions of the belt cover ply is formed of rubber having a  $\tan \delta$  at a temperature of 60°C that is equal to or less than 0.1.

The examiner recognizes that Boiocchi discloses an auxiliary belt strip, but is silent regarding the material used to form the strip. Instead, the examiner relies on Kojima for disclosing a belt cover ply (which corresponds to the auxiliary belt strip of Boiocchi) with a coating rubber having a  $\tan \delta$  at a temperature of 60°C that is less than or equal to 0.1. Kojima discloses a coating rubber with a loss factor selected in a range of 0.1 or less, but Kojima uses this rubber for a belt ply, not a belt cover ply. A belt ply is used to give a hoop effect to a tire. On the other hand, a belt cover ply prevents the belt ply from swelling outward in a radial direction due to forces applied to the tire while it is spinning. Thus, the belt ply and belt cover ply are designed to perform very different functions. Accordingly, it is not obvious that the rubber for a belt ply disclosed by Kojima could be used in a belt cover ply. For this reason, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 9 and 10.

Claims 3, 5, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boiocchi and Kojima and further in view of Mochida (JP 02074403) and

Yamamoto (JP 06092108). Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1, and claims 11 and 13 depend from claim 9. Accordingly, these claims include all the features of their associated independent claims, plus additional features. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent claims 3, 5, 11 and 13 be withdrawn in light of the above remarks directed to claims 1 and 9, and also because Mochida and Yamamoto do not remedy the deficiencies identified with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 9.

Claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boiocchi, Kojima, Mochida and Yamamoto, and further in view of Motomura (USPN 5,215,612). Claim 4 ultimately depends from claim 1, and claim 12 ultimately depends from claim 9. Because claims 4 and 12 necessarily incorporate the features of their respective independent claims, and because Motomura fails to overcome the identified deficiencies of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 14 and 16 stand rejected under Serra (WO 2002/26878) in view of Boiocchi and Kojima. Applicant traverses this rejection because none of the cited prior art references, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest that the coating rubber of at least the extension portions of the belt cover ply is formed of rubber having a  $\tan \delta$  at a temperature of 60°C that is equal to or less than 0.1.

Serra, like Boiocchi, discloses a reinforcing layer covering two belt strips. However, both Serra and Boiocchi are silent regarding materials used to form the reinforcing layer. Accordingly, applicant assumes that the examiner relies on Kojima for teaching this

feature. As stated above, Kojima discloses that rubber having a  $\tan \delta$  at a temperature of 60°C that is equal to or less than 0.1 is used as coating rubber in a belt ply, and not in a belt cover ply. While the belt ply gives a hoop effect to a tire, the belt cover ply prevents the belt ply from swelling outward in a radial direction due to forces applied while the tire rotates. Thus, the two effects are quite different. Accordingly, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the coating rubber for a belt ply as disclosed by Kojima when forming a belt cover ply. For this reason, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 8-10, 14 and 16.

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serra, Boiocchi and Kojima, and further in view of Kan (USPN 4,444,236) and Haneda (JP 07257116). Claim 7 ultimately depends from claim 1, and claim 15 ultimately depends from claim 9. Because each of these claims incorporates the limitations of its respective independent claim, and because Kan and Haneda fail to overcome the identified deficiencies of the rejections of independent claims 1 and 9, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

February 14, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978